



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,741	02/14/2005	Aliaksandr Alexeevich Antanouski	670570.10	6548

7590 06/11/2007  
Francis C Hand Carella Byrne Bain Gilfillan  
Cecchi Stewart & Olstein  
5 Becker Farm Road  
Roseland, NJ 07068

EXAMINER
----------

MALEVIC, DJURA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2884

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/11/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,741

Applicant(s)

ANTANOUSKI, ALIAKSANDR  
ALEXEEVICH

Examiner

Djura Malevic

Art Unit

2884

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 8 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION****Election/Restrictions**

Applicant's election of invention 1 in the reply filed on 05/30/2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 7, 8 and 16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 05/30/2007.

**Specification**

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet **within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied,

Art Unit: 2884

such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10 and 12 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phelps (US Patent 4,857,739) in view of Allemand et al. (US Patent 4,461,952).

With regards to claim 9, Phelps discloses a portable radiation monitoring system comprising a circuit network (See figure 1) connected to a power supply unit 17 for receiving power, a Geiger-Muller counter 11 for detecting radiation and for delivering corresponding signals to said network for calculation of an effective radiation dose, a voltage pulse converter (i.e., transformer configuration) connected between said network and GM counter 11 for transforming a low voltage from said network controller into a constant high voltage (i.e., primary to secondary windings) for transmission to GM counter 11 and a pulse former 35 connected to and between said GM counter and said network for converting impulses from GM counter into predetermined shapes for processing in said network (Also, see feedback network, Figure 1). Phelps does not expressly disclose a portable watch further comprising a case and a

Art Unit: 2884

timekeeping and/or time indicating unit connected to said network. Note, watches comprising a radiation monitoring system are well known and conventionally used in the art. For example, Allemand teaches a watch for measuring radiations. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Phelps to include a radiation monitoring system in a watch such as that taught by Allemand in order to alert the user in a convenient and handy matter of radiation received in a course of certain works.

With regards to claim 10, Phelps discloses a switch key connected between same network and GM counter for periodically switch said GM counter 11 on and off for measuring radiation intensity in a gated mode in response to a signal from the said network (Col. 3, Line 32++).

With regards to claim 12, Phelps discloses pulse former has an inlet connected to a low-voltage side of a power supply filter capacitor of said GM-counter and an outlet connected to said network (See capacitance feedback network).

With regards to claim 13, Phelps discloses said voltage pulse converter includes a transformer 19 having primary windings connected to said network and secondary windings connected to a cathode of said GM counter 11 for applying a reference (i.e., 500V) voltage to said cathode.

With regards to claim 14, Phelps discloses a switch key connected to and between said network and said primary windings of said transformer 19, a threshold device 55 connected to and between said primary windings and said

Art Unit: 2884

network and rectifier having a filter (see diode and capacitive network) operatively connected to and between said secondary windings and said cathode of said GM counter 11 for passing voltage to said cathode.

With regards to claim 15, Allemand discloses a display section on said watch for displaying an indication of the accumulated radiation dose (Col. 8, Line 11).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phelps and Allemand in view of Weise (US Patent 5,469,412).

With regards to claim 11, Phelps and Allemand disclose the claimed invention according to claim 9 but fail to expressly disclose a second power supply unit. Wise teaches a second power supply in a watch comprising a radiation detector (Col. 3, Line 31). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Phelps and Allemand to include a second power supply such as that taught by Weise in order to provide fail safe power and to provide indicate any voltage drop at the primary battery.

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djura Malevic whose telephone number is 571.272.5975. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday between 8:30am and 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2884

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**Djura Malevic**  
**Patent Examiner**  
**Art Unit 2884**  
**571.272.5975**

  
**CONSTANTINE HANNAHER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**